SUPREME COURT, U. S.
FILED
DEC 9 1974
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 74-714

DAVID T. DELLINGER, ABBOTT H. HOFFMAN, JERRY C. RUBIN, and WILLIAM M. KUNSTLER,

Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

MORTON STAVIS
DORIS PETERSON
c/o Center for Constitutional Rights
853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003
(212) 674-3303

Attorneys for Petitioners

Adams Press Corp., 150 Cedar Street, N. Y.—Beekman 3-1050-51

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PETITION

	Page
TABLE OF CASES AND AUTHORITIES ...	vi
CITATION TO OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	
Questions presented as to petitioner Kunstler alone	2
Questions presented as to all petitioners, including the petitioner Kunstler	3
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
A. Background	4
B. Facts specifically relevant to the questions presented for review to this Court	12
1. Facts relevant to the alleged contempts of Mr. Kunstler (Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4)	12
Specification VI	12
Specification VII	17
2. Facts relating to discriminatory prosecution of Mr. Kunstler (Question 5)	20
3. Facts relevant to the electronic surveillance issue (Question 6)	28
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	33

Page

I.
THE PETITION PRESENTS FOR REVIEW AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION WHICH HAS BEEN DECIDED BY THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT IN CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND THREATENS SERIOUS MISAPPREHENSION THROUGHOUT THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM THAT THE CONTEMPT PROCESS MAY BE USED FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN THE PREVENTION OF "ACTUAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE" AND SPECIFICALLY THAT IT MAY BE USED TO PUNISH VIGOROUS DEFENSE COUNSEL IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD UNDERMINE THE RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL UNDER THE SIXTH AMENDMENT 33
A. Kunstler specification VI 33
B. Kunstler specification VII 37
II.
THE PETITION PRESENTS FOR REVIEW A DECISION OF THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT IN CONFLICT WITH DECISIONS OF OTHER CIRCUITS, AND DEALING WITH AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW WHICH HAS NOT BUT SHOULD BE SETTLED BY THIS COURT, NAMELY, WHAT IS THE PROPER STANDARD OF "INTENT" IN A CONTEMPT PROSECUTION UNDER 18 U.S.C., SEC. 401 40

Page

III.
THE PETITION PREVENTS FOR REVIEW IMPORTANT QUESTIONS OF PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS IN THE CONTEMPT CONTEXT: A) WHAT IS THE PROPER APPLICATION OF THE NOTICE REQUIREMENTS IN CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS UNDER RULE 42(b) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, A QUESTION WHICH HAS NOT BEEN BUT SHOULD BE SETTLED BY THIS COURT; AND B) MAY A CONVICTION FOR CONTEMPT BE SUSTAINED ON A CHARGE NOT MADE, OR WHERE IT APPEARS THAT THE CONVICTION COULD HAVE BEEN BASED ON CLEARLY NON-OBSTRUCTIVE CONDUCT, A QUESTION WHICH THE CIRCUIT COURT HAS DECIDED IN THIS CASE IN A WAY PLAINLY IN CONFLICT WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT? 45

A. What is the proper application of the notice requirements in contempt proceedings under Rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules Criminal Procedure? 45

B. May a conviction for contempt be sustained on a charge not made, or where it appears that the conviction could have been based on clearly non-obstructive conduct? 49

Page

IV.
THE PETITION PRESENTS FOR REVIEW THE IMPORTANT QUESTION AS TO THE UNEQUAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW, NOT HERETOFORE DETERMINED BY THIS COURT, NAMELY, WHETHER DEFENSE COUNSEL CAN CONSTITUTIONALLY BE CONVICTED OF CONTEMPT WHERE THE GOVERNMENT PROCEEDS ON THE THEORY THAT THE CONTEMPT PROCESS IS TO BE EMPLOYED ONLY AGAINST DEFENSE COUNSEL AND NOT AGAINST PROSECUTORS GUILTY OF THE SAME ACTS OF WHICH DEFENSE COUNSEL WERE CONVICTED 50

V.
THE PETITION PRESENTS FOR REVIEW AN IMPORTANT QUESTION NOT HERETOFORE DETERMINED, NAMELY, WHETHER A CONTEMPT IS GOVERNED BY THE RULE OF ALDERMAN v. U.S., REQUIRING DISCLOSURE OF UNLAWFUL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE TO A DEFENDANT HAVING STANDING AND DENYING TO A COURT THE POWER TO MAKE EX PARTE DETERMINATION OF RELEVANCE AFTER IN CAMERA INSPECTION 53

Page

VI.
THE PETITION PRESENTS FOR REVIEW AN IMPORTANT QUESTION NOT HERETOFORE DETERMINED BY THIS COURT, NAMELY, WHETHER AS A MATTER OF PUBLIC POLICY THE CONTEMPT POWER IS AVAILABLE TO PUNISH THE TARGETS OF JUDICIAL AND PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT WHICH WAS OF SUCH AN EXTRAORDINARY NATURE AS TO CAUSE A BREAKDOWN OF THE JUDICIAL PROCESS 58
CONCLUSION 64

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

Opinion and judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, decided September 6, 1974 ..... 1a
Opinion of District Judge Gignoux of November 6, 1973, on motion at end of government's case 31a
Specification VI relating to Mr. Kunstler 69a
Specification VII relating to Mr. Kunstler
Part I 73a
Twelve pages of transcript omitted by Judges Hoffman and Gignoux from Specification VII 75a
Part II 85a
Motion for disclosure of electronic or other surveillance, for a full investigation of surveillance, and for further relief 89a

Page

Schedule of representation of defendants in the contempt case by attorneys and legal workers, showing persons represented and period of their representation ... 100a
Constitutional amendments, statute, and rule involved
Fourth Amendment 108a
Fifth Amendment 108a
Sixth Amendment 109a
18 U.S.C., Sec. 401 ..... 110a
Rule 42(b), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 110a

TABLE OF CASES AND AUTHORITIES

Alderman v. United States, 394 U.S. 165 (1969) ..... 3, 28, 29, 32, et passim
Anderson v. Dunn, 6 Wheat. 204 (1821) 59, 63
Bloom v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 194 (1968) 60
Boyce Motor Lines v. United States, 342 U.S. 337 (1952) 42
Bridges v. California, 314 U.S. 252 (1941) 33, 60
Brown v. United States, 356 U.S. 148 (1958) 34
Caldwell v. United States, 28 F. 2d 684 (9th Cir., 1928) 42
Cole v. Arkansas, 333 U.S. 196 (1948) 45
Cooke v. United States, 267 U.S. 517 (1925) 41

Page

Cooper v. Superior Court,
55 Cal. 2d 291, 10 Cal. Rptr. 842,
359 P. 2d 274 (1961) 44
Craig v. Harney,
331 U.S. 367 (1947) 34, 36
Dellinger v. Mitchell,
Civ. Action No. 1768-69, D.D.C. 31
Eaton v. Tulsa,
415 U.S. 697 (1974) 45,48,49
Gelbard v. United States,
408 U.S. 41 (1972) 58
Gompers v. Bucks Stove & Range Co.,
221 U.S. 418 (1911) 59
Holt v. Virginia,
381 U.S. 131 (1965) 34, 40
Hygrade Provision Co. v. Sherman,
266 U.S. 497 (1925) 42
Illinois v. Allen,
397 U.S. 337 (1970) 59
In re Abse,
251 A. 2d 655 (D.C. Ct. of App., 1969) .. 63
In re Brown,
454 F. 2d 999 (D.C. Cir., 1971) 41
In re Dellinger,
461 F. 2d 389 (1972) 4,5, 41, 52
et passim
In re Dellinger,
unreported opinion of Judge
Gignoux (App. 37a) 27
In re Little,
404 U.S. 553 (1972) 34
In re McConnell,
370 U.S. 230 (1961) 33, 34, 37,38
et passim
In re Michael,
326 U.S. 224 (1945) 59
In re Oliver,
470 F. 2d 10 (1972) 37